

presented by scientific names based upon modern patronymics, although it is likely that it is in relation to this class of name that the present problem will most frequently arise. It might however arise in the case of scientific names based on the names of places or even upon words, other than patronymics or place names, drawn from languages other than Latin. It is desirable therefore that the ruling to be given should be so drawn as to cover all cases of this kind.

7. A somewhat similar problem arises when, for example, a name based upon a word containing a letter with (say) an umlaut over it is written not with an umlaut (as in the case of *Törnquistia*) but with an "e" inserted after the vowel concerned (as *Toernquistia*). It would be even more illogical and undesirable to accept as valid generic names both the name *Törnquistia* and *Toernquistia* than it would be to accept as such the names *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia*. It is accordingly suggested that the ruling now to be given should cover this class of case also.

8. Finally, it is naturally essential that, whatever ruling is given in relation to generic names—the class of case with which the present application is immediately concerned—should apply equally to trivial names.

9. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to render a Declaration containing a ruling that, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy in relation both to generic names (Article 34) and to trivial names (Article 35), (1) the presence or absence of a diacritic mark over one or more of the letters in a scientific name derived from a word belonging to some language other than Latin is to be ignored in determining whether that name is a homonym of some other name, and (2) that, where in the formation of a name, the presence of a diacritic mark over one of the letters in the word on which that name is based is indicated not by a diacritic mark but by the insertion of an additional vowel after the letter concerned, the name so transliterated is to be treated as a homonym of any other name based upon the same word and transliterated with a diacritic mark over the vowel in question.

**ON AN AMBIGUITY IN ARTICLE 20 OF THE "RÈGLES"  
BROUGHT TO LIGHT BY DR. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S  
APPLICATION FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION OF  
WHETHER NAMES BASED ON WORDS CONTAINING  
LETTERS HAVING A DIACRITIC MARK ARE TO BE  
REGARDED AS HOMONYMS WHEN ONE MEMBER OF A  
PAIR OF SUCH NAMES IS PRINTED WITH A DIACRITIC  
MARK AND IN THE OTHER AN ADDITIONAL VOWEL IS  
USED TO INDICATE WHERE THE DIACRITIC MARK  
APPEARED IN THE WORD ON WHICH THE NAME IS  
BASED: PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A "DECLARATION"**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)540)**

1. In the concluding portion of her application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a ruling on the question whether such

generic names as *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896 (a name given in honour of the Swedish palaeontologist Leonhard Törnquist) and *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann, 1930 (a name given in honour of the German palaeontologist A. J. H. Tornquist) are to be regarded as homonyms of one another (File Z.N.(S.)538) Dr. Helen Muir Wood raises the further question whether a generic (or trivial) name based upon a word containing a letter distinguished by a diacritic mark is to be regarded as a homonym of another generic name based upon the same word in which however the diacritic mark which appeared in the original word is reproduced in the generic or trivial name concerned by the insertion of an additional vowel.

2. Dr. Muir-Wood's second question, which is, in effect, whether, for example, if there were two generic names, each given for a zoologist named Hübner and for one of which the form of latinisation adopted under Article 3 led to the formation of a generic name *Hübneria* and for the other a generic name *Huebneria* the two names so formed are to be treated as homonyms of one another, is one on which there can, it seems to me, be no room for difference of opinion, since the use of a modified "u" on the one hand and the vowels "ue" on the other hand represent no more than different methods of transcribing a letter which did not appear in the Latin alphabet, when (as in forming a scientific name) it is necessary to Latinise such a word. It is evident, therefore, that two generic names such as those cited above are in every sense identical with one another. It follows automatically therefore that such names are homonyms of one another for the purposes of zoological nomenclature. Nevertheless, Dr. Muir-Wood's request for a ruling on this question is to be welcomed, for the provision of an answer to the question which she has raised will eliminate from the *Règles* an ambiguity which is undesirable in itself and one which is particularly unwelcome to those zoologists who hold that questions involving issues on etymological, grammatical or similar matters should arise as seldom as possible in the *Règles*.

3. The purpose of the present note is to suggest that, when the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature proceeds to consider Dr. Muir-Wood's application, it should consider also the relation of that application to the existing Article 20 in the *Règles*. That Article reads (in the substantive French text): "Pour la formation de noms empruntés aux langues s'écrivant avec l'alphabet latin, on conserve l'orthographe originale, y compris les signes diacritiques". Among the examples there given are the generic names *Köllikeria* and *Mülleria*. The above provision, which forms part of the original text of the *Règles* as adopted by the Fifth International Congress of Zoology at Berlin in 1901, was supplemented in 1907 (by a decision by the Seventh International Congress of Zoology, Boston, 1907) by the addition of a "Recommendation" (adopted in English and for which no substantive French text was ever prepared), which reads as follows:—"In proposing new names based on personal names, which are written sometimes with "ä", "ö" or "ü", at other times with "ae", "oe" and "ue", it is recommended that authors adopt "ae" "oe" and "ue." Apart from the value of the advice given, this "Recommendation" serves a useful purpose in making it clear that the sole subject matter of Article 20 is the preservation of the distinction between such patronymics as

"Müller" and "Muller" and in consequence between generic names based upon such patronymics (e.g., *Mülleria* and *Mulleria*) and not with the method to be adopted in transliterating diacritic signs when a word, one of the letters of which has a diacritic mark above it, is latinised, on the word in question being used as part of a scientific name. We see therefore that, what Article 20 says is, in effect, that, where (for example) a generic name is given in honour of a man named "Müller", the diacritic mark over the second letter of the man's name is to be preserved, on the latinisation of the word, and that the resulting generic name is not to take the form "Muller". The mandatory portion of Article 20 contains no provisions at all as to the method to be adopted in preserving the diacritic mark, when such a patronymic as "Müller" is latinised on being embodied in a generic name. The Boston "Recommendation" of 1907 does, however, give advice on this subject, favouring the use of a second vowel rather than the perpetuation of the actual diacritic mark itself.

4. The Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 adopted a provision requiring, *inter alia*, that breaches of the provisions of Article 20 are automatically to be corrected by later authors (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 67-68). The suggestion now submitted is that, when taking a decision on the allied proposals submitted by Dr. Muir-Wood, the International Commission in Zoological Nomenclature should also give a ruling (through the adoption of a *Declaration*) that the breaches which are automatically to be corrected relate only to cases where (as in the case of a generic name based on the name "Müller" but published as *Mulleria*) a diacritic mark which appeared in the patronymic on which a name is based is incorrectly omitted altogether on the latinisation of the name for the purpose of forming a generic name. It would be helpful also if at the same time it were to be made clear in express terms that Article 20 does not prescribe any particular method of reproducing a diacritic mark, on a word containing a letter with such a mark above it being Latinised, this being a matter on which authors publishing new names are free to use their discretion, though (as agreed upon by the Boston Congress) they are advised, when Latinising a word containing a letter with an umlaut above it, to indicate that diacritic mark by inserting the letter "e" immediately after the vowel which, prior to the word being Latinised, was surmounted by an umlaut. The automatic correction prescribed by the Paris Congress does not, therefore, apply as between one method of indicating a diacritic mark and another, being concerned only to secure that, where, on a word being Latinised, a diacritic mark is improperly omitted, it shall automatically be restored by later authors.

